

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Eastern District of Michigan

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V.

Ubaldo Castaneda-Tapia*Defendant***ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL**

Case Number: 14-30464

In accordance with the Bail Reform Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been held. I conclude that the following facts require the detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.

Part I—Findings of Fact

- ☐ (1) The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a ☐ federal offense ☐ state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed - that is
- ☐ a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).
- ☐ an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death.
- ☐ an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in _____.*
- ☐ a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses.
- ☐ (2) The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.
- ☐ (3) A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the ☐ date of conviction ☐ release of the defendant from imprisonment for the offense described in finding (1).
- ☐ (4) Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an) other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption.

Alternative Findings (A)

- ☐ (1) There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense
- ☐ for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in _____.
- ☐ under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).
- ☐ (2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.

Alternative Findings (B)

- ☐ (1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.
- ☒ (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.

Part II—Written Statement of Reasons for Detention

I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by ☒ clear and convincing evidence ☐ a preponderance of the evidence that

SEE ATTACHED

Part III—Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

September 16, 2014

Date

s/ Mona K. Majzoub

Signature of Judge

MONA K. MAJZOUB - UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Name and Title of Judge

*Insert as applicable: (a) Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 *et seq.*); (b) Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. § 951 *et seq.*); or (c) Section 1 of Act of Sept. 15, 1980 (21 U.S.C. § 955a).

14-30464 USA v Ubaldo Castaneda-Tapia

Defendant is charged with Re-Entry of a Removed Alien. On September 3, 2104 Defendant was arrested in Shelby Township, Michigan, having been previously removed to Mexico most recently on May 8, 2014, at or near El Paso, Texas. Apparently Defendant's mother and family are living here illegally, and Defendant, who first came to this country with his mother when he was 11 years old, continues to return to her home after being removed to Mexico on multiple occasions.

Defendant admits that has no legal status in this country. A detainer has been lodged with INS. He has been arrested and removed on three occasions in the past: August 3, 2010, September 17, 2013 and May 8, 2014.

A preponderance of the evidence establishes that Defendant poses a risk of nonappearance but not a danger to the community. At the age of 18 he was charged with possession of alcohol by a minor, but he has no other convictions.

Little is known about his community ties or his employment. There is no information about his financial situation, his health status, or any other pertinent details that Pretrial Services usually evaluates due to the fact that no interview was conducted. He does have retained counsel, however, who is aggressively pursuing his immigration case.

Pretrial Services recommends Detention and this Court concurs. There is no condition or combination of conditions that would assure Defendant's appearance in Court. Therefore Detention is Ordered.